UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS' CONCUSSION INJURY LITIGATION))) _)	12-MDL-2323-AB
KEVIN TURNER and SHAWN WOODEN, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,)))	
Plaintiffs,)	
vs.)	
NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE and NFL PROPERTIES, LLC,)))	
successor-in-interest to)	
NFL Properties, Inc.,)	Philadelphia, PA May 4, 2018
Defendants.)	10:06 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANITA B. BRODY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff	CHRISTOPHER SEEGER, ESQUIRE
Jim Finn, et al.	SEEGER, WEISS, LLP
	6th Floor
	55 Challenger Road
	Ridgefield, NJ 07660

For Non-Party: PETER C. BUCKLEY, ESQUIRE
Thrivest Specialty FOX ROTHSCHILD, LLP
Funding, LLC 20th Floor
2000 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Audio Operator: JAMES F. G. SCHEIDT

Transcribed by: DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING, LLC

P.O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026-0129

Office: (856) 435-7172 Fax: (856) 435-7124

Email: <u>dianadoman@comcast.net</u>

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

	Case 2:12-md-02323-AB Document 10008 Filed 05/21/18 Page 3 of 9		
			3
1	<u>INDEX</u>		
2			
3	<u>ARGUMENT</u> :	PAGE	
4	By Mr. Buckley	3	
5	By Ms. Seeger	6	
6			
7			
8	RULING BY THE COURT:	PAGE	
9	By Judge Brody	17	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Case 2:12-md-02323-AB Document 10008 Filed 05/21/18 Page 4 of 9 Buckley - Argument 4 (The following was held in open court at 10:06 a.m.) 1 THE COURT: Okay, we're going to be --2 3 COURTROOM DEPUTY: On the record? 4 THE COURT: Yes, we are on the record. I have on 5 the record Mr. Peter Buckley representing -- excuse me, 6 representing Thrivest Specialty Funding in Civil Action Number 7 12-2323, and I have Mr. Seeger on the phone, is that correct, 8 Mr. --9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. There's a request for an emergency ruling on the part of the Court and I've honored 11 your request, Mr. Buckley --12 13 MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: -- so in fact I'm in on a Friday, so I 15 would like to know what you -- would you like to argue to me? 16 MR. BUCKLEY: Yes, Your Honor, I think our 17 arguments --18 THE COURT: One minute because I know you have 19 20 need -- why you think you need the testimony of this person 21

another call so why don't you -- why don't you tell me why you for -- for the preliminary -- the injunction -- it's a full injunction -- why?

MR. BUCKLEY: Your Honor, the class counsel has raised an issue in his motion for -- for injunction as to the formation of an agreement to arbitrate which I believe is a

22

23

24

25

threshold issue before Your Honor that must be decided, and as

I point out in my motion, there's a distinction between the

validity of an entire agreement and the validity of the

arbitration clause.

And the Supreme Court in Rent-A-Center and in Buckeye Check Cashing made clear that an arbitration provision is severable from the remainder of the contract and that a party's challenge to another provision of the contract, for example a challenge to the assignment language in the contract or to the -- you know, contract as a whole on the basis that it violates the settlement agreement does not prevent a Court from enforcing a specific agreement to arbitrate.

So it's my belief that unless Mr. Seeger concedes that Mr. W entered into an arbitration agreement with Thrivest, that I need to be able to take some discovery on that issue so that we can present Your Honor with evidence that notwithstanding any dispute over the validity of the transaction under the settlement agreement, that there is a valid and enforceable agreement to arbitrate consistent with the Supreme Court's Rent-A-Center and Buckeye decisions such that that threshold question must be answered first.

And, if it is determined that there is an agreement to arbitrate, that any challenge to the validity of the agreement must go before an arbitrator.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Seeger, do you wish to

Seeger - Argument / Ruling by the Court respond?

MR. SEEGER: Yeah, two quick points. One is the mental state of Mr. W, by the way, Your Honor, who has ALS, is very sick, has nothing to do with the contract that has been deemed by Your Honor void ab initio. The agreement is gone. There's no issue on the ab-- arbitration. This is pure harassment.

The other part of it is, and it's very suspicious, that Mr. Buckley chose to file a complaint to compel arbitration in a Federal Court that is not -- and it's not Your Honor, who has the MDL, has the settlement agreement, control over the class members, the lawyers and every provision in the settlement.

It's harassment. It's an attempt to go end-run around your order and Mr. White's mental state has nothing to do with a contract that is void.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEEGER: We oppose it.

THE COURT: All right. I'm making a legal ruling that as far as I'm concerned, the only issue before me is the validity of the order that -- for this -- that hearing that I scheduled -- I think it's the 9th -- that the only issue before me is whether or not I had authority to enjoin the -- because that's what the issue -- that's what the hearing's about -- whether I had the authority to enjoin the

Colloquy 7

arbitration.

So I think that no evidence is necessary, Mr.

Buckley. You brought it up, I am making a ruling at this

point so that you have that in your -- you know, you know

where I stand I'll see you on the 9th.

MR. BUCKLEY: May I be heard just shortly, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, I already ruled so I don't think the answer --

MR. BUCKLEY: I understand, I just want to clarify something.

THE COURT: All right, sure.

MR. BUCKLEY: I understand then that Mr. Seeger is not going to argue at this hearing that Mr. White didn't sign the documents or that's not his initials at the bottom of that page, but rather that the agreement is invalid under the settlement agreement and therefore that argument, you know, invalidates the entire agreement including the arbitration clause. And if that is the argument --

MR. SEEGER: Your Honor, I --

MR. BUCKLEY: -- that I'm responding to, then I understand that there's really no reason to address the formation of the arbitration agreement, we're really dealing with a legal argument and we probably don't need his deposition.

Colloquy 8 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Buckley --1 2 MR. BUCKLEY: But because of what Mr. --3 THE COURT: Mr. Buckley, that will be argued on the 4 9th so you can argue on --5 MR. BUCKLEY: The other thing I wanted to put on the record, Your Honor, is in our motion -- I believe it was 6 7 footnote 1, we asked Your Honor to clarify whether the motion to withhold has been decided. 8 9 THE COURT: Mr. Buckley, that's my ruling on what 10 you put before me. My ruling is it's denied. That's all 11 that's going on today. If you have any other issues you wish to raise, you'll raise them on the 9th, okay? 12 13 MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right, bye. 15 MR. SEEGER: Thank you. 16 (Matter concluded, 10:12 a.m.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

I, Diane Gallagher, court approved transcribers, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

DIANE GALLAGHER DATE

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING, LLC